



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,675	10/02/2003	Christopher J. Stone	BCS03171	8844
43471	7590	03/04/2010		
Motorola, Inc. Law Department 1303 East Algonquin Road 3rd Floor Schaumburg, IL 60196			EXAMINER	
			MENDOZA, JUNIOR O	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2423	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/04/2010 ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docketing.US@motorola.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/677,675

Applicant(s)

STONE ET AL.

Examiner

JUNIOR O. MENDOZA

Art Unit

2423

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-23 and 26-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-23 and 26-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/28/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 12/28/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding **claims 1, 7, 15, 20 and 26**, applicant argues that Altmann and Kessler do not teach that "the source device determines a closed captioning format supported by said display device".

However, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. Altmann discloses a technique of transmitting auxiliary data, such as closed caption data, from a content source, i.e. set top box; see abstract and col. 3 lines 34-41. Altmann further recites that the content source receives a message, i.e. display properties signal 175, from a display device (sink device) which allows the source device to decide whether the display device is capable of processing the auxiliary data and determining whether to send to auxiliary data based on said message

information; col. 3 lines 61-67, col. 4 lines 1-11 and figure 1B. Furthermore, Altmann discloses that the display properties data may be stored in a PROM implementing an EDID standard; and that the display device responds to a query from the content source (when the display device is initially connected) by sending the properties data signal 175 to the content source, col. 6 lines 9-20 and lines 42-52. It is clear that in response to receiving the display properties signal 175 message, the source device is the one apparatus which processes and determines the properties of the display device.

Furthermore, Kessler discloses that it is well known in the art for television receivers to be able to display closed captioning content depending on its capabilities, in other words, EIA-608 captioning standard for analog television receivers and EIA-708 captioning standard for digital television receivers. Since the system of Altmann determines closed captioning capabilities for a display by means of the EDID file, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further include information related to closed captioning formats supported by the television receiver. Altmann and Kessler combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. Therefore, Altmann and Kessler clearly disclose that "the source device determines a closed captioning format supported by said display device".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 3, 4, 7 – 10, 12, 15 – 18 and 26 – 29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altmann (Patent No US 7,143,328) in view of Hayes et al. (Patent No US 6,938,101) further in view of Kessler et al. (Patent No US 6,373,526). Hereinafter, referenced as Altmann, Hayes and Kessler, respectively.

Regarding **claim 1**, Altmann discloses a method for selectively passing closed caption data from a source device to a display device (Col. 3 lines 34-38) comprising:

receiving a data signal in said source device, said data signal including un-rendered closed caption data and video data (Col. 3 lines 34-38, a set top box, i.e. source, receives data signals which include un-rendered closed caption data from a head end);

separating said video data from said un-rendered closed caption data (Col. 3 line 58 - col. 4 line 11; wherein un-rendered closed caption data is either separated or multiplexed to a signal sent to the sink device based on the sink device capabilities);

determining, by the source device, closed caption processing capabilities of said display device (Col. 3 line 58 - col. 4 line 11; the source device determines the capabilities of the display device, i.e. sink device),

wherein the source device determines a closed captioning feature supported by said display device (Col. 3 lines 34-35, col. 6 lines 1-20; the display device properties are included in the EDID file stored at the source, which encodes feature bits to indicate the type of auxiliary features, i.e. caption data, supported);

and transmitting said un-rendered closed caption data to said display device if said display device is configured to process un-rendered closed caption data (Col. 3 line 58 - col. 4 lines 11; wherein the closed caption data is transmitted, i.e. output auxiliary data, to the display device if the display device is capable of processing the closed caption data based on the information in the EDID of the display device).

However, it is noted that Altmann fails to explicitly disclose determining if said display device has requested said un-rendered closed caption data; and transmitting-said un-rendered closed caption data to said display device only if said display device has requested said un-rendered closed caption data.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Hayes discloses determining if said display device has requested said un-rendered closed caption data; and transmitting-said un-rendered closed caption data to said display device only if said display device has requested said un-rendered closed caption data (Col. 26 lines 24-48; Hayes discloses that the source device; e.g. set top box, receives a closed caption request command from a display device and the source device sends the closed caption data

only if the display device has requested the closed caption data, the act of determining whether the display device has requested un-rendered closed caption data is inherent because closed caption data is only sent when it is requested).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Altmann by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Hayes, for the purpose of allowing users of a plurality of display devices connected to one source device to utilize the closed caption feature without affecting the program display on the other display devices.

However, it is noted that Altmann and Hayes fail to explicitly disclose that a display device may support different closed captioning formats.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Kessler discloses that a display device with a close captioning feature may support different closed captioning formats (Col. 1 line 34-38 and 45-50, col. 6 lines 40-58; televisions are able to display closed captioning content depending on its tuning capabilities, in other words, EIA-608 captioning standard for analog television receivers and EIA-708 captioning standard for digital television receivers).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the determining of a closed caption feature of Altmann and Hayes by including support for different closed captioning formats, as taught by Kessler, for the predictable result of not only analyzing whether a display device is capable of supporting closed captioning but to further distinguish between

analog and digital television receivers, which would allow interactivity with new and legacy devices.

Regarding **claim 3**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose the method of claim 1; moreover, Altmann discloses that said determining closed caption processing capabilities of said display device comprises:

communicating with said display device via said source device (Col. 6 lines 1- 20 and lines 42-65);

accessing extended display identification data (EDID) corresponding to said display device (Col. 6 line 7);

and determining closed caption processing capabilities of said display device based on said EDID (Col. 6 lines 5-13 and col. 3 lines 34-38; wherein the source device determines the auxiliary data capabilities of the display device based on EDID information, wherein auxiliary data can include captions).

Regarding **claim 4**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose the method of claim 1; moreover, Altmann discloses that said communication with said display device occurs over a digital visual interface (DVI) (Col. 2 lines 64-66; DVI interface).

Regarding **claim 7**, Altmann discloses a system for selectively passing closed caption data from a source device to a display device (See abstract and col. 3 lines 34-38) comprising:

a source device (Col. 3 lines 36-38; disclosed as set top box, a computer, or a DVD player, etc);

and a sink device communicatively coupled to said source device (see fig. 1B fig. 4A, col. 3 l1.61-65, col. 3 lines 16-23; wherein the sink device is a receiver or a display device and is coupled to the source device by means of a DVI link);

wherein said source device is configured to receive a data signal including un-rendered closed caption data and video data (Fig. 11, col. 3 lines 34-35; display device receives auxiliary data signals the are comprised of closed caption data, and video data),

separate said video data from said un-rendered closed caption data (see col. 3 l1.58 - col. 4 l1.11; wherein un-rendered closed caption data is either separated or multiplexed to a signal sent to the sink device based on the sink device capabilities),

determine, by the source device, closed caption processing capabilities of said sink device, and if said sink device is configured to process un-rendered closed caption data, transmit said un-rendered closed caption data to said sink device (Col. 3 line 58 - col. 4 line 11; the source device determines the capabilities of the display device, i.e. sink device),

wherein the source device determines a closed captioning feature supported by said sink device (Col. 3 lines 34-35, col. 6 lines 1-20; the display device properties are

included in the EDID file stored at the source, which encodes feature bits to indicate the type of auxiliary features, i.e. caption data, supported);

However, it is noted that Altmann fails to explicitly disclose that if a sink device requests un-rendered closed caption data, then transmit said un-rendered closed caption data to said sink device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Hayes discloses that if a sink device requests un-rendered closed caption data, then transmit said un-rendered closed caption data to said sink device (Col. 26 lines 24-48; Hayes discloses that the source device; e.g. set top box, receives a closed caption request command from a display device and the source device sends the closed caption data only if the display device has requested the closed caption data, the act of determining whether the display device has requested un-rendered closed caption data is inherent because closed caption data is only sent when it is requested).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Altmann by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Hayes, for the purpose of allowing users of a plurality of display devices connected to one source device to utilize the closed caption feature without affecting the program display on the other display devices.

However, it is noted that Altmann and Hayes fail to explicitly disclose that a display device may support different closed captioning formats.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Kessler discloses that a display device with a close captioning feature may support different closed captioning formats

(Col. 1 line 34-38 and 45-50, col. 6 lines 40-58; televisions are able to display closed captioning content depending on its tuning capabilities, in other words, EIA-608 captioning standard for analog television receivers and EIA-708 captioning standard for digital television receivers).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the determining of a closed caption feature of Altmann and Hayes by including support for different closed captioning formats, as taught by Kessler, for the predictable result of not only analyzing whether a display device is capable of supporting closed captioning but to further distinguish between analog and digital television receivers, which would allow interactivity with new and legacy devices.

Regarding **claim 8**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose the system of claim 7; moreover, Altmann discloses that said source device comprises a set-top box (Col. 3 lines 36-38).

Regarding **claim 9**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose the system of claim 7; moreover, Altmann discloses that said sink device comprises one of a digital television, a computer monitor, or a projector (Col. 6 line 2).

Regarding **claim 10**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose the system of claim 7; moreover, Altmann discloses that said source device is communicatively coupled to said sink device via a digital visual interface (Col. 2 lines 64-66).

Regarding **claim 12**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose the system of claim 7; moreover, Altmann discloses that said source device (Col. 3 lines 36-38).

However, it is noted that Altmann and Hayes fail to explicitly disclose that the source device is configured to be communicatively coupled to a head end unit.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Kessler discloses that a source device is configured to be communicatively coupled to a head end unit (Figure 1; broadcaster 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Altmann and Hayes by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Kessler, for the purpose of enabling subscribers to purchase premium programming from the head-end.

Regarding **claims 15, 16, 17 and 18**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose all the limitations of claims 15, 16, 17 and 18; therefore, claims 15, 16, 17 and 18 are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 7, 8, 9 and 10, respectively.

Regarding **claims 26, 28 and 29**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose all the limitations of claims 26, 28 and 29; therefore, claims 26, 28 and 29 are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 1, 3 and 4, respectively.

Regarding **claim 27**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose the processor readable medium of claim 26; however, it is noted that Altmann fails to explicitly disclose that said processor instructions further instruct a processor to only transmit said un-rendered closed caption data to said display device upon request from said display device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Hayes discloses processor instructions which instruct a processor to only transmit un-rendered closed caption data to a display device upon request from said display device (Col. 26 lines.24-48; Hayes discloses that the source device, i.e. set top box, receives a closed caption request command from a display device and the source device sends the closed caption data only if the display device has requested the closed caption data, the act of determining whether the display device has requested un-rendered closed caption data is inherent because closed caption data is only sent when it is requested).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Altmann by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Hayes, for the purpose of allowing users of a plurality of display devices connected to one source device to utilize the closed caption feature

without affecting the program display on the other display devices.

5. **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altmann, Hayes and Kessler in view of Carlsgaard et al. (Pub No US 2002/0186320). Hereinafter, referenced as Carlsgaard.

Regarding **claim 6**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose the method of claim 1; moreover, Altmann discloses not rendering said closed caption data to said display device if said display device is not configured to process un-rendered closed caption data (Col. 4 lines 2-11).

However, it is noted that Altmann, Hayes and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose rendering said closed caption data in said source device for processing. Nevertheless, the applicant recites in the background that traditional DVI/HDMI implementations require the video receiver to process and render closed captions to a display device (Paragraph [0004] of originally filed specification).

Furthermore, in a similar field of endeavor Carlsgaard discloses rendering said closed caption data in said source device for processing (Paragraph [0032] figure 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Altmann, Hayes and Kessler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Carlsgaard, for the purpose of allowing users with older display devices to view closed captions by enabling the television receiver to process closed caption data and render it to the display television.

6. **Claims 11, 19 and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altmann, Hayes and Kessler in view of Jon Iverson, "HDMI 0.9 Released", 30th June 2002, UltimateAVmag.com. Hereinafter, referenced as Iverson.

Regarding **claim 11**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose the system of claim 7; moreover, Altmann discloses that said source device is communicatively coupled to said sink device via an interface (Col. 2 lines 64-66).

However, it is noted that Altmann, Hayes and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose using HDMI.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Iverson discloses using HDMI interfaces which may be implemented for communication between source devices and display devices (Paragraph 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Altmann, Hayes and Kessler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Iverson, for the purpose of combining high definition video with multi channel audio in a single interface (see Iverson paragraph 5), eliminating the need for multiple connections to transmit video and multi-channel audio.

Regarding **claims 19 and 30**, Altmann, Hayes, Kessler and Iverson disclose all the limitations of claims 19 and 30; therefore, claims 19 and 30 are rejected for the same reasons stated in claim 11.

7. **Claims 13, 14, 20, 21, 22, and 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altmann, Hayes and Kessler in view of Ozawa et al. (Patent No US 7,023,858). Hereinafter, referenced as Ozawa.

Regarding **claim 13**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose the system of claim 7; moreover, Altmann discloses that said source device comprises:

- a central processing unit (Col. 3 lines 36-38; set to box),
- a digital visual interface input/output (Col. 2 lines 64-66),
- an 12C bus communicatively coupling said central processing unit and said digital visual interface input/output (Col. 6 lines 54-55);

However, it is noted that Altmann, Hayes and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose that a source device may comprise a number of data storage units, and a processor communicatively coupled to the central processing unit and to the digital visual interface input/output.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Ozawa discloses that a source device may comprise a number of data storage units (Col. 4 lines 6-7),

- and a processor communicatively coupled to the central processing unit and to the digital visual interface input/output (Col. 6 lines 5-24 and figure 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Altmann, Hayes and Kessler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Ozawa, for the purpose of enabling the optimization of rapid video processing as disclosed by Ozawa; moreover, allowing the storage of media and/or auxiliary data in the source device.

Regarding **claim 14**, Altmann, Hayes, Kessler and Ozawa disclose the system of claim 13; moreover, Altmann discloses that said source device is configured to determine closed caption processing capabilities of said sink device through said digital visual interface input/output (Col. 3 line 58 - col. 4 line 11).

Regarding **claim 20**, Altmann discloses a source device configured to selectively pass closed caption data from a source device to a display device (Col. 3 lines 34-38) comprising:

- a central processing unit (Col. 3 lines 36-38; set to box);
- a digital visual interface input/output (Col. 2 lines 64-66);
- an I2C bus communicatively coupling said central processing unit and said digital visual interface input/output (Col. 6 lines 54-55);

wherein said source device is configured to receive a data signal including un-rendered closed caption data and video data (Col. 3 lines 34-38, a set top box, i.e. source, receives data signals which include un-rendered closed caption data from a head end),

separate said video data from said un-rendered closed caption data (Col. 3 line 58 - col. 4 line 11; wherein un-rendered closed caption data is either separated or multiplexed to a signal sent to the sink device based on the sink device capabilities),

determine, by the source device, closed caption processing capabilities of a communicatively coupled display device (Col. 3 line 58 - col. 4 line 11; the source device determines the capabilities of the display device, i.e. sink device),

wherein the source device determines a closed captioning feature supported by said display device (Col. 3 lines 34-35, col. 6 lines 1-20; the display device properties are included in the EDID file stored at the source, which encodes feature bits to indicate the type of auxiliary features, i.e. caption data, supported);

and if said display device is configured to process un-rendered closed caption data, transmitting said un-rendered closed caption data to said display device (Col. 3 line 58 - col. 4 lines 11; wherein the closed caption data is transmitted, i.e. output auxiliary data, to the display device if the display device is capable of processing the closed caption data based on the information in the EDID of the display device).

However, it is noted that Altmann fails to explicitly disclose that if a sink device requests un-rendered closed caption data, then transmit said un-rendered closed caption data to said sink device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Hayes discloses that if a sink device requests un-rendered closed caption data, then transmit said un-rendered closed caption data to said sink device (Col. 26 lines 24-48; Hayes discloses that the source device; e.g. set top box, receives a closed caption request command from a display

device and the source device sends the closed caption data only if the display device has requested the closed caption data, the act of determining whether the display device has requested un-rendered closed caption data is inherent because closed caption data is only sent when it is requested).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Altmann by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Hayes, for the purpose of allowing users of a plurality of display devices connected to one source device to utilize the closed caption feature without affecting the program display on the other display devices.

However, it is noted that Altmann and Hayes fail to explicitly disclose that a source device may comprise a number of data storage units, and a processor communicatively coupled to the central processing unit and to the digital visual interface input/output.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Ozawa discloses that a source device may comprise a number of data storage units (Col. 4 lines 6-7),

and a processor communicatively coupled to the central processing unit and to the digital visual interface input/output (Col. 6 lines 5-24 and figure 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Altmann and Hayes by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Ozawa, for the purpose of enabling the optimization of rapid video processing as disclosed by Ozawa; moreover, allowing the storage of media and/or auxiliary data in the source device.

However, it is noted that Altmann and Hayes fail to explicitly disclose that a display device may support different closed captioning formats.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Kessler discloses that a display device with a close captioning feature may support different closed captioning formats (Col. 1 line 34-38 and 45-50, col. 6 lines 40-58; televisions are able to display closed captioning content depending on its tuning capabilities, in other words, EIA-608 captioning standard for analog television receivers and EIA-708 captioning standard for digital television receivers).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the determining of a closed caption feature of Altmann and Hayes by including support for different closed captioning formats, as taught by Kessler, for the predictable result of not only analyzing whether a display device is capable of supporting closed captioning but to further distinguish between analog and digital television receivers, which would allow interactivity with new and legacy devices.

Regarding **claims 21, 22 and 23**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose all the limitations of claims 21, 22 and 23; therefore, claims 21, 22 and 23 are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 3, 4 and 8, respectively.

8. **Claim 31** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altmann, Hayes and Kessler in view of Magendanz et al. (Pub No US 2004/0080482). Hereinafter, referenced as Magendanz.

Regarding **claim 31**, Altmann, Hayes and Kessler disclose the method of claim 1; moreover, Altmann discloses a source device connected to a display device, wherein the source device selectively is selectively transmitting un-rendered closed caption data only to the display device only if the display device is configured to process un-rendered closed caption data and if the display device has requested the un-rendered closed caption data (See rejection of claim 1).

However, it is noted that Altmann, Hayes and Kessler fail to explicitly disclose that the source device is in communication with a plurality of display devices.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Magendanz discloses that the source device is in communication with a plurality of display devices (Paragraph [0035] fig 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Altmann, Hayes and Kessler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Magendanz, for the benefit of providing the user with the ability of connecting a plurality of display devices to a source device and having the same amount of desktop space (display size) of a large display while saving money.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUNIOR O. MENDOZA whose telephone number is (571)270-3573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571)272-7296. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Junior O Mendoza
Examiner
Art Unit 2423

/J. O. M./
February 21, 2010

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2423